

REMARKS

The Examiner's action of June 24, 2008 is noted in which the claims are variously rejected under 35USC112 paragraph 2, 35USC102, and 35USC103.

Applicant has obviated the rejection under USC35112 paragraph 2 by the insertion of appropriate language, and reconsideration is requested. This leaves the rejection of claims based on the Niu et al reference both under 35USC102 and 35USC103. Applicant claims that by reprogramming the interconnect layer is possible to use existing hardware, without alteration, to effectuate a new function.

Nowhere is this shown in the reference of record.

It is noted most assuredly that the router function of the Niu et al reference is not changed by reprogramming of anything. This is because in their illustrated embodiment its function cannot be changed by anything Niu et al do. If Niu et al were going to reconfigure their packet switched application they would have to do a complete new redesign.

To be clear, the Niu et al reference describes a data packet router. The router can't do anything except route. It can't be a software receiver; it can't be a jammer; it can't do spatial processing; and it can't do signal intelligence. It can only function as a router. If one were to take a router and try to reconfigure it to function as any of the above it would involve a massive redesign.

Applicant claims one can effectuate change in the functionality (mode) of a compute engine by reprogramming the interconnect layer. This can effectuate a complete

mode change using the reconfigurable interconnect layer so that no physical connection need be changed to effectuate mode change.

On page 7 of the subject specification it says:

"It is the purpose of the interconnection layer to be reconfigurable regardless of what is happening with the application . . . and to set the connections for the physical layer both as to what connections corresponds to what operation, and also the modality of the pin itself, whether it be a receiver pin, a transmitter pin, or a timing connection."

Also on page 7,

"The subject invention thus provides the user with the flexibility of dynamically defining the modes and the interconnects necessary between the RCEs." (emphasis supplied)

What is eminently clear and claimed is that one can change the mode of operation of a reconfigurable compute engine by reprogramming the interconnect layer while leaving everything else alone.

The ability to change mode is nowhere shown in Niu et al.

In view of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and issuance of the case is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert K. Tandler

Reg. No.: 24,581

65 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, MA 02110

Tel: (617) 723-7268

Date:

Sept. 24, 2008